

STAFF DEVELOPMENT IN CALIFORNIA'S PUBLIC SCHOOLS



Recommendations
of the Policy Development Committee
for the California Staff Development Policy Study

REPORT 88-21
MARCH 1988

The California Postsecondary Education Commission has published this report for the Policy Development Committee of the California Staff Development Policy Study, which is solely responsible for its content. Additional copies of the report, published as Report 88-21, may be obtained from the Library,

California Postsecondary Education Commission
1020 Twelfth Street, Third Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814-3985
Telephone (916) 322-8031

Like other publications of the Commission, this report is not copyrighted. It may be reproduced in the public interest, but proper attribution to its author, the Policy Development Committee of the California Staff Development Policy Study, and to Report 88-21 of the California Postsecondary Education Commission is requested.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT IN CALIFORNIA'S PUBLIC SCHOOLS

•

Recommendations
of the Policy Development Committee
for the California Staff Development Policy Study

MARCH 25, 1988



PUBLISHED FOR THE COMMITTEE
BY THE CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Preface	1
Observations and Conclusions	5
Teachers	6
Schools	6
Districts	6
Regional Entities	7
State	7
Two Major Themes	8
Findings and Recommendations	8
Finding 1: Costs	8
Finding 2: Salary Credits	9
Finding 3: Professional Commitment	11
Finding 4: District Support	12
Finding 5: Influence of Staff Development	13
Finding 6: Existing Patterns	14
Finding 7: Evaluation	15
Finding 8: State Policy	15
Appendix: Minority Opinions	17
References	25

PREFACE

The 1986 Budget Act (Item 6420-011-001) funded the California Postsecondary Education Commission to oversee a study of staff development in California's public elementary and secondary schools. The study included two phases, the first data collection, and the second policy development.

State policy makers initiated this study seeking a better information base and policy framework for making decisions about staff development budget requests. During the 1985-86 fiscal year, \$83 million in State and federal funds went to specific statewide staff development programs for school personnel in California's elementary and secondary schools. But when all related activities of individuals and local school districts are counted, actual expenditures greatly exceed this amount. This project was intended to provide a clear mapping of all these activities and to use the information collected to build State policy alternatives for the State Legislature, the Administration, and the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE) were selected to conduct the descriptive phase of the study.

The Far West Laboratory information gathering effort focused on fiscal year 1985-86 and calendar year 1986, and consisted of five parts:

1. An inventory of state and federal programs;
2. A description of local patterns of use, based on a representative sample of 32 school districts and the regional resources available to them,
3. A statewide survey of 1,200 teachers and 200 administrators aimed at describing personal perspectives and experiences with regard to professional development;
4. A statewide survey of all districts, counties and state funded regional service providers; and
5. Review of staff development efforts in other states.

The Far West Lab/PACE findings are available in these two volumes:

- *Staff Development in California. Public and Personal Investments, Program Patterns, and Policy Choices Volume I Executive Summary; and*
- *Staff Development in California Public and Personal Investments, Program Patterns, and Policy Choices Volume II Findings, Conclusions, and Technical Appendices.*

A broadly representative Policy Development Committee was convened in the Fall of 1987 to review the Far West Laboratory/PACE findings and develop a policy framework for use by the Legislature and Department of Finance in considering future funding requests in this area. This report of the Committee, whose members are listed below, provides policy recommendations that flow directly from the Far West Laboratory/PACE key findings and outlines a policy framework for improving the structure and implementation of current staff development offerings.

The Technical Advisory and the Policy Development Committees played major roles in the successful completion of this project. The policy recommendations in this document represent a consensus of the members of the Policy Development Committee except for those with an asterisk (*) by their name. These individuals have either expressed reservations about the policy recommendations or suggested modified recommendations and have chosen to submit minority opinions that appear in the Appendix

Particular thanks are due James Guthrie (PACE), Judith Warren Little (Far West Laboratory), and members of a special writing committee, Phillip Bowman, Janis Cox, Michael McKibbin, and Laura Wagner, without whose hard work this report could not have been completed.

Members of the Committee

School Professionals

* B. Phillip Bowman, Retired Superintendent, Vallejo Unified
School District

David Evans, Superintendent, San Juan Union School District

Donna Kay LeCzel, Teacher and Staff Developer

Grace Matteis, Consultant, Orange County Office of Education

Harley North, Superintendent, Evergreen Union School District

Miriam Studley, Teacher, Monte Vista Intermediate School,
Pleasant Valley School District

Susan Taira, Consultant, Professional Development Center,
Los Angeles Unified School District

Carole Teall, Director of the Management Academy,
San Diego County of Education

Association of California School Administrators

Jodie King, Director, Professional Development

California Federation of Teachers

* Miles Myers, President

California State Department of Education

James Smith, Deputy Superintendent, Curriculum/Instructional
Leadership Branch

California State Department of Finance

* Francis Schultz, Budget Analyst

The California State University

Jennie Spencer Green, Assistant Dean, Academic Programs and
Policy Studies

California Teachers Association

* Deborah Edginton, Manager, Instruction and Professional
Development

California School Boards Association

Linda Leopardi, Director, Board Policy Services

Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Michael McKibbin, Consultant, Program Evaluation and Research

County Superintendents Association

Louis Bosetti, Superintendent, Tehama County Office of Education

Legislative Staff

Linda Bond, Senior Consultant, Senate Education Committee

William Furry, Consultant, Minority Ways and Means Committee

Janet Jamieson, Consultant, Assembly Minority Caucus

* Glee Johnson, Senior Consultant, Senate Minority Fiscal Consultants

Rick Simpson, Consultant, Assembly Education Committee
Subcommittee on Educational Reform

Office of the Legislative Analyst

Paula Mishima, Program Analyst

Office of the Governor

Anne McKinney, Assistant Advisor, Education

University of California

Janis Cox, Principal Analyst, Office of the President

Observers

Fred Tempes, Assistant Superintendent, Instructional Support
Services Division, California State Department of Education

Bill Padia, Administrator, Program Evaluation and Research,
California State Department of Education

Laura Wagner, Administrator, Intersegmental Relations Division,
California State Department of Education

Sue Garmston, Consultant, Office of Staff Development, California
State Department of Education

Gary Longholm, Director, Governmental Affairs, California State
Department of Education

Diana Rude, Consultant, Assembly Economic Development and
New Technologies Committee

California Postsecondary Education Commission

William K. Haldeman, Project Director

Mary Vixie Sandy, Assistant Project Director

OBSERVATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

The charge to the Policy Development Committee was to submit policy recommendations for the Legislature to use in formulating a state policy to guide staff development for classroom teachers and administrators. The Policy Development Committee recommends that the Legislature consider the following elements for such a policy framework.

The State of California must recognize the integral importance of professional development for faculty and administrators to the success of elementary and secondary education. The state should also recognize that teaching and learning are complex work conducted in a dynamic setting of constant change in the knowledge to be learned, in the technology of the tools to be used and in the cultural diversity of the group itself. These conditions require that those in the education profession continually update their knowledge and skills in order to be effective.

Staff development is the professional vehicle that facilitates life-long learning for the classroom teacher and administrator. It should not be a one-time undertaking. For staff development to be effective, there must be continued, systematic, coherent attention to the needs of both individual educators and the schools in which they work.

California's professional development programs for teachers and administrators are that set of programs, services and courses of study which are designed to ultimately improve the performance of students by:

- Providing teachers in all disciplines access to new content knowledge and instructional techniques in the subjects they teach;
- Communicating to staff new and improved techniques for general instruction and classroom management;
- Building among staff a collegiality and commitment to organizational goals; and
- Strengthening the professional status of staff positions and their role in improving education.

A comprehensive policy framework must take into account the appropriate role for each of the following individuals and organizations:

TEACHERS

- Teachers should be encouraged to develop professional improvement plans, and such plans should be required when teachers wish to earn salary credits for participation in staff development.
- Individual teacher staff development plans should be articulated with school improvement goals, balancing individual teacher interest and needs with the needs of the school, the district and the state.

SCHOOLS

- Schools should be charged as the primary staff development unit. The school is where teachers, students and parents with the leadership of a principal are melded into an instructional team with the potential to create individual and organizational change. Although staff development has long been a component of School Improvement Program (SIP) plans, not all schools have access to these funds, nor do the schools with SIP funds take full advantage of the time allowed for professional development activities.
- School staff development plans should be consensually developed and devote attention to specific purposes and outcomes, what content will be delivered, by whom, how the content will be provided, and what incentives, resources and support will be dedicated to see that teaching improves as a result.

DISTRICTS

- Districts should provide the leadership that allows the school to become the primary decision making unit. The governing board, the superintendent and all others in the system should develop and implement policies and practices that support and assist each school's instructional team.
- Districts are uniquely positioned to establish curricular and instructional priorities and then decentralize decisions for implementation at the school level.

REGIONAL ENTITIES

- Good programs for the continuing education of teachers require upfront developmental work, for which many smaller and medium-sized districts lack the resources. Institutions of higher education, educational laboratories, and professional associations should collaborate with school districts and county offices to develop rigorous discipline-based staff development programs for classroom teachers.
- Given the size of the state, regional agencies, representing collaborations among districts and other educational entities, could also reasonably be charged to conduct developmental work, help school and district staffs plan and evaluate their efforts, and provide or broker needed services.

THE STATE

- The state has a legitimate role and interest in staff development programs to reflect the content of state adopted curriculum frameworks and model curriculum standards and the pressing needs of the changing teacher and student population. The state should invest resources in university-related, discipline-based programs that are designed to assist teachers in integrating new knowledge and curriculum priorities into their classroom activities.
- The state should consider a portfolio of incentives for teachers, schools and districts to participate in staff development and for colleges and universities, county offices, and other educational entities to develop and conduct professional improvement programs for elementary and secondary teachers.

As noted throughout this discussion, flexibility will be a key feature of a statewide policy framework that permits educational professionals, schools, and districts to pursue both individual and collective staff development goals and coincidentally enable the state to achieve its over-arching objectives for students. Whatever the system, it will have to adapt to the constantly evolving purposes of schooling. Both leadership and compromise will be needed to design such a system, and almost assuredly it will have to be periodically redesigned.

TWO MAJOR THEMES

Two major themes frame this analysis of the California Staff Development Policy Study:

- The first is that staff development for California's classroom teachers and administrators is an important investment in human resources, one that if pursued in a systematic, sustained, and coherent manner, will provide long-term benefits to the students of this state.
- The second is that a more comprehensive vision of staff development purposes and means to achieve them is needed to organize the diverse staff development programs and patterns currently operating in the state.

What staff development should teachers receive? How should resources be allocated? Who should decide its content and how should services be provided? These are the central policy questions for state and local policy makers to address in developing a coordinated statewide approach to staff development for California's classroom teachers. The Staff Development Policy Study did not assess the effectiveness of staff development in improving teachers' classroom instruction. Rather, through descriptive surveys and in-depth structured interviews, the study assessed the range of staff development offerings and the overall ability of the present system to provide high quality professional development programs.

The following findings and recommendations of the Committee are intended to provide a policy framework for responding to these questions. They are organized around the eight major findings of the Far West Laboratory-PACE study.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

FINDING 1: COSTS. Staff development programs and services for teachers and administrators consume approximately 1.8 percent of California's education funding -- a total of \$366 million during a one-year period.

The cost of staff development programs and services for California's approximately 274,600 classroom teachers and administrators averages about \$1,300 per person annually.

However, because much staff development is voluntary and not every educator participates nor has access to services, each individual did not receive \$1,300 worth of service. Nevertheless, this figure is roughly equivalent to the amounts identified by Howey and Vaughn (1983) and Moore and Hyde (1986) of \$1,100-1,700 for classroom teachers. At the same time, it is less than the estimated direct monetary outlay of major U.S. corporations on staff development for professionals with responsibilities equivalent to those of teachers (approximately \$1,800-2,500, according to Little, 1988).

RECOMMENDATION 1: We recommend a continued investment in staff development of at least the level reflected in the study (\$366 million), for the continuing professional development of California educators.

•

FINDING 2: SALARY CREDITS. The future financial obligation for salary advances that teachers accrue as a result of advanced university courses or salary credits awarded by the district is the taxpayers' largest investment in staff development.

Future salary obligations made to teachers who accrue credits through university or district-sponsored coursework annually total \$600 million. Individual teachers in the study annually accumulated an average of two semester units, which have an average salary value of \$87 each, or \$1,400 when accrued over the professional career of the individual. When added to the general fund and categorical program allocations and aggregated across all teachers, the total taxpayer investment in staff development exceeds 4 percent of total education funding, or approximately \$1 billion per year.

Increasing one's salary by taking courses to earn career salary credits is a widespread feature of American school governance and the primary route for teachers to increase their teaching income.

There is a widely held perception that little direction is given for the selection and integration of courses taken. Districts should set up guidelines to assist teachers in selecting courses and other staff development activities that will improve their classroom instruction and professional practice.

California's colleges and universities offer teachers a wide array of staff development opportunities, most of which are linked to the content of the disciplines they teach. Among those are a number of credible, high quality and effective staff development programs. The central features of these quality programs are.

- Explicit goals that are clearly and consistently linked to student learning;
- Program content, strategies and activities are derived from tested discipline research and practice;
- Teachers are engaged in training teachers;
- Long-term, incremental activities are reinforced at the school and classroom level by local support networks; and
- Close partnership with schools and districts.

Most colleges and universities have formed some kind of relationship with local school districts. However, the expertise and resources available from postsecondary institutions often is not fully utilized. The priorities of traditional academic offerings in these institutions do not lend themselves to close collaborative efforts with teachers or school districts. If state policy makers are serious about sustained college and university participation in staff development, then existing collaborative models should be built upon, and colleges and universities should be encouraged to recognize the importance of such work. The California Writing Projects, California Mathematics Projects, California Literature Project, the California School Leadership Academy, and the State University Intersegmental Programs for new teachers provide examples of these types of collaborative models.

RECOMMENDATION 2.1: We recommend that salary increases for credits accrued through university and district coursework be given only for staff development activities pursued within the context of an individual teacher's plan for staff development. These plans should reflect not only the individual teacher's needs, but school and district priorities.

RECOMMENDATION 2.2: We further recommend that institutions of higher education be encouraged to develop a broad range of discipline-based staff development programs in collaboration with the

public schools. Such initiatives should be linked to the teaching and research of the core college and university academic programs.

•

FINDING 3: PROFESSIONAL COMMITMENT. California teachers and administrators demonstrate a firm commitment to improving their own knowledge and practice.

Nearly all California teachers participated in some version of local staff development in 1986. Teachers enthusiastically support the idea of staff development and report "access to new ideas" as the major incentive for participation. However, when held up against the template of "good staff development practices" as defined both by teachers and the research literature, less than one-fourth of the workforce participated in high quality staff development programs. Over and over teachers in the study described the most worthwhile staff development as having been:

- An integrated combination of subject area knowledge and pedagogy;
- Days, rather than hours, in length;
- Scheduled partly or wholly during the salaried work day with substitutes;
- Accompanied by follow-up consultation, observation, materials, or additional training, and
- Voluntary.

Collaborative work with colleagues is an important form of staff development. Teachers endorse proposals to allocate time to work with other teachers and colleagues, but 80 percent say that they rarely or never are granted time to do so. Both teachers and administrators state a strong preference for joint decisionmaking about staff development, and for teacher leadership in conducting staff development, yet school and district leaders continue to be the primary decisionmakers about the content and delivery of such programs.

RECOMMENDATION 3: We recommend that teachers have greater participation with administrators in the design and conduct of staff development programs and services. We further recommend that the characteristics of worthwhile staff development, as identified by teachers, be included among the guidelines for these activities.

•

FINDING 4: DISTRICT SUPPORT. Local school district capacity to organize and deliver staff development has grown steadily.

Staff development programs are intended to help teachers teach students better and work together more effectively as school faculties. Over the past twenty years, the capacity of individual school districts to organize and deliver effective staff development has grown steadily, particularly in the large and medium sized districts which offer solid skills development programs. However, districts' current capacity to offer in-depth, long term study across a wide range of specific curricular topics and associated instructional practices, and their ability to provide follow-up support at the school level are fairly limited

Geography also makes a difference. Teachers and administrators in the rural areas of California have vastly fewer professional development opportunities and resources than their counterparts in urban and suburban areas. So too, the capacity of county offices of education to provide staff development services varies greatly. With the exception of the larger counties with urban centers and ready access to universities, most counties devote the bulk of their resources to providing fiscal and direct student services for special populations, and where resources allow, they may offer a market-driven set of staff development programs

Further, the demographics of California's student and teacher populations are changing and new knowledge is growing rapidly. Therefore, it is particularly important that state policy makers have a clear vision and a strategic approach that sets priorities for meeting these changing needs.

RECOMMENDATION 4: We recommend that professional development resources be allocated to:

- 1. Minimize the potential negative impact of a school district's size or geographic location;**
- 2. Recognize the economies of scale in allocating time, money, and human resources to develop high quality programs;**
- 3. Support regional consortia of districts, county offices, and colleges and universities to develop and provide these services; and**
- 4. Design staff development programs that give particular attention to the instructional needs of a changing student population.**

•

FINDING 5: INFLUENCE OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT. Selected staff development activities have sound prospects for favorably influencing classroom performance and the overall quality of school programs. On the whole, however, the current array of staff development activities and incentives is unlikely to yield substantial change in the thinking or performance of California's classroom teachers.

Teachers describe worthwhile staff development in terms that are consistent with prior research: effective staff development is closely tied to instructional assignment and circumstances and permits intensive study by pursuing one or two key topics over a period of weeks or months. However, the Far West Laboratory/PACE research found that relatively few staff development activities have this character. Most staff development is not linked to well-established school improvement plans, or supported by school level follow-up and support.

Prior research indicates that the most effective staff development is designed to be consistent with the overall strategic vision of the school and the district. For example, whether a district is encouraging the development of magnet schools or the teaching of writing across the curriculum, the staff development to support implementation needs to be organized and managed by those most directly involved and provided by those with the most appropriate expertise. Teachers and administrators should cooperatively decide what staff development activities are necessary for the organization to achieve its objectives. From this judgment flow decisions about providers, intensity, and follow-up activities.

RECOMMENDATION 5: We recommend more comprehensive school-level planning for staff development. Such plans should:

1. Help teachers pursue their individual staff development goals;
2. Help school staffs pursue school and district improvement goals;
and
3. Build upon existing plans and program priorities.

FINDING 6: EXISTING PATTERNS. California's staff development resources are spent in ways that generally reinforce existing patterns of teaching, conventional structures of schools and long-standing traditions of the teaching occupation.

Schools as organizations benefit from the collective growth of individuals. Staff development ought to provide school staffs with opportunities to evaluate existing patterns of teaching and decide how it might be improved. However, schools are not currently organized in ways that easily facilitate organizational improvement. The hierarchical, bureaucratic structure that characterizes the organization of schooling in America today runs counter to recommendations from *A Nation At Risk*, the Carnegie and Holmes groups, and the National Governor's Association recommendations that schools and teaching need to be reorganized to better help disaffected youth achieve and encourage professionalism in the teaching occupation. Some pilot initiatives in "restructuring school" hold promise for changing existing patterns of school organization and governance

The quality of staff development is constrained by the sheer number of demands on teacher time. Elementary and secondary teachers work intensively with students but have little time for adult-to-adult interaction. As long as the salaried work day and work year provide relatively little out-of-classroom time, the odds in favor of effective staff development are diminished. Thus, teacher time should be redefined such that instructional time with students does not compete with time for teachers to interact with one another on instructional issues.

RECOMMENDATION 6: We recommend that financial resources and incentives be provided to:

1. **Extend the contract year to provide time for classroom teachers to participate in staff development without diminishing student instructional time. (Any time so designated should be used to provide school level staff development within an approved plan tied to school and district improvement goals.)**
2. **Develop pilot initiatives to explore new school and district governance models.**

•

FINDING 7: EVALUATION. California's staff development activities are largely unevaluated.

Staff development programs throughout the nation are largely unevaluated and, with some exceptions, the evaluation tends to be dominated by participation rate and process measures. It is very expensive and difficult to identify direct benefits to students resulting from teacher participation in staff development. To do so, one must rigorously control for diversity in student knowledge, ability in learning, school and district environments, and teacher characteristics and learning needs. Consequently, evaluation must stop short of the ultimately desired objective and settle for measures of content and process that have been documented as related to teacher learning. However, over time, the state should give attention to the development of evaluation models that can become more conscious of measuring changes in teacher performance as a result of staff development. Perhaps eventually, state policy makers will have a better understanding of the linkage between staff development, teacher performance, and student achievement.

Few teachers in the survey believe that they are accountable for what they learn in staff development, and most staff development is not linked to individual teacher performance appraisal.

RECOMMENDATION 7.1: We recommend that program evaluations be required in any state-funded staff development initiatives. Further, as schools develop staff development plans, they should consider staff needs as evidenced by needs assessments, performance evaluations, and school program reviews.

RECOMMENDATION 7.2: Because the study also found that staff development is generally disconnected from personnel evaluation, we recommend teachers and administrators consider the benefits of changing this arrangement.

•

FINDING 8: STATE POLICY. The state annually appropriates staff development funds for teachers, schools, districts, counties, and universities, but it lacks a comprehensive or consistent policy orientation toward staff development or toward institutions that provide it.

Present-day, state-sponsored staff development programs have grown by accretion, without a clear vision of which programs meet which purposes, or which level of the educational delivery system is most appropriate to con-

trol, deliver, or evaluate them. This was the hypothesis that motivated this study, and for which the research team found considerable evidence. Staff development should be organized within a comprehensive vision for educational improvement at all levels and teachers, schools, districts and the state should know what their goals are and how they will realize them.

RECOMMENDATION 8: We recommend that each level of the elementary-secondary educational system have a staff development component tied to their organizational improvement plan. We encourage other educational entities, such as colleges and universities, professional associations, and educational laboratories, to consider ways in which they can contribute to the success of these state staff development efforts.

APPENDIX: MINORITY OPINIONS

•

Comments submitted by B Phillip Bowman, Retired Superintendent, Vallejo Unified School District

I find the report of the Policy Development Committee to be excellent. It reflects the findings of the California Staff Development Policy Study and the best thinking of a fine group of professionals. While I certainly support the report and the recommendations, I do hereby offer some modified recommendations.

The School Improvement Program (SIP) has been in operation for ten years. According to the Governor's 1988-89 Budget, the primary objective of the School Improvement Program is "to improve the instructional program for elementary and secondary schools through the development of a school-level plan which addresses student assessment, goal setting, improved curriculum and instruction, staff development and school climate. Local school site councils comprised of school personnel, parents, and in secondary schools, students, design and evaluate the improvement plan for their schools. The district master plan for school improvement outlines the policies and procedures for phasing in, developing, and reviewing school plans and programs for schools participating in the School Improvement Program. Triennial program quality reviews which include self studies and action plans for growth are a central part of the improvement process."

As indicated in the report of this study, "the planning and evaluation processes associated with the School Improvement Program (SIP) and School Site Staff Development (AB 551) are well grounded in research and experience. Though uneven in practice, they nonetheless continue to serve as reasonable models." Thousands of teachers and other professionals have worked successfully with this program. It seems wise to build on all that experience.

The Staff Development Program which results from the SIP process is based on instructional improvement plans. Furthermore, the law (E C Section 52019) requires that staff development "be designed and implemented by classroom teachers and other participating school personnel, including the school principal, with the aid of outside personnel as necessary." Any group formed to design this program shall have a majority of classroom teachers

in its membership. Continual evaluation and modification of the program is required. Assuming that the teachers and principal are aware of the characteristics of effective staff development, I am confident that they will develop the best possible program for themselves and their colleagues.

In this matter as with any state policy issue, the question arises relative to the amount of flexibility provided to a school, its principal and teachers. For example, should the staff address the problem of teacher time by providing funds to lengthen the contract year or to explore all the possibilities? SIP now makes it possible for districts and schools to do the latter as they deal with the needs of all their students.

At the present time, approximately 5,000 of a total 7,500 schools participate in SIP. Of the participating schools, approximately 19 percent have 7th and 8th grade students and about 20 percent are high schools. With the rapidly changing student population, it seems that every school should have the resources to systematically and continually plan and implement the strategies necessary to meet the needs of all students

With these thoughts in mind, the following recommendations are suggested in relation to findings 4, 5 and 6

Recommendation 4.

We recommend that financial resources be allocated to:

1. Expand SIP to every school that chooses to participate.
2. Schools with the SIP so that they may design and implement programs which give particular attention to the instructional needs of a changing student population.
3. Minimize the potential negative impact of a school district's size or geographic location, and
4. Support regional consortia of districts, county offices and colleges and university to develop and provide these services.

Recommendation 5.

We recommend more comprehensive school level planning for staff development which is based upon school improvement plans and program

quality criteria including the needs of special students. Such plans should

1. Help teachers pursue their individual staff development goals,
2. Help school staffs pursue school and district improvement goals, and
3. Build upon existing plans and program priorities.

Recommendation 6.

We recommend that financial resources and incentives be provided through SIP to allow schools and districts to:

1. Consider options, including the extension of the contract year, for solutions to the problem of providing time for classroom teachers to participate in staff development without diminishing student instructional time.
2. Consider the use of new school and district governance models.

Comments submitted by Deborah Edginton, Manager, Instruction and Professional Development, California Teachers Association.

The policy paper as presented by the Policy Development Committee for the California Staff Development Policy Study represents a great deal of concentrated thought and effort. While I support most of the recommendations in the report, I would like to address certain sections.

The report asserts that staff development to improve the performance of students includes providing teachers with access to new content knowledge, instructional techniques and classroom management skills. Staff Development will build collegiality and professional status with commitment to organizational goals. The report encourages each teacher to develop a professional improvement plan by requiring it before salary credit can be given for participation in higher education programs. This plan must reflect not only professional goals of the individual teacher but school and district priorities (Recommendation 2 1) Teachers are to have greater participation with administrators to develop and implement staff

development programs (Recommendation 3). Staff development should help teachers reach individual, school and district goals and build on existing plans and priorities (Recommendation 5). To do this the contract year should be extended but not the instructional year (Recommendation 6). The teacher's staff development plan should, according to Recommendation 7 1, be connected to that teacher's personnel evaluation.

I hope the recommendations will be received with the following considerations. The classroom is the proper focus for decisions regarding staff development. Since teachers are the ultimate providers of education, they should be the major decisionmakers regarding staff development programs. In a total program of staff development with a goal of improved student achievement, there are two main areas to be served. One is the growth of the professional toward greater competence and the other is made up of the educational priorities and goals of the school community, district and state. These are not always mutually exclusive.

It appears from the recommendations that the staff development priorities may still be set by school and district level administrators based on state requirements. Teachers professional growth may still be held hostage to salary schedules (Rec. 2.1), parent committees (p. 6), and personal professional pedagogical preferences of the principal through personnel evaluations. Restructuring the way staff development is delivered and used will determine the professional future of teaching.

Comments submitted by Glee Johnson, Senior Consultant, Senate Minority Fiscal Consultants

I have reviewed the final draft of the policy report, and I would like to support it. However, I do have two reservations (discussed below) which I would appreciate included as an appendix to the report. It should also be understood that these comments are reflective of my opinion only, and do not represent those of any member of the Senate Republican Caucus.

1. Recommendation 6: I have no problems with this recommendation per se; however, I think it should be noted that school districts currently have

up to eight staff development days available to them out of the 180 day year. That is, they already may redirect 8 days that would otherwise be devoted to student instruction to staff development. I believe that without this information, the implication to the reader of the report is that teachers currently have to do *all* staff development outside of their work day and work year, which simply isn't true.

2. **Recommendation 8:** I think this recommendation is backwards. I think, given that salary increases result directly from many staff development activities, that the presumption should *start* with a relationship between personnel evaluation and staff development. It would then be a matter of demonstrating why such a connection would *not* be beneficial. Why are we conducting staff development if not to improve performance?

Comments submitted by Miles Myers, President, American Federation of Teachers

I have several problems with the policy paper

A. First, the report does not highlight the importance of "subjects" in staff development. Staff development should be organized around what is taught in schools -- both subjects and students in particular age groups. Staff development evaluations and research on teaching suggest that the best staff development is focused on "subjects" taught in school -- writing, reading, mathematics -- and not generic topics like "clinical coaching," "motivation," "planning," and so forth. The "tech" centers always had a problem -- technology for what -- math, reading, writing, history?? Finally, the best staff development recognizes how "subjects" change from one grade or developmental level to another and attempts to provide an overall history of development for all teachers. In other words, some cross-grade grouping and some developmental materials are essential.

B. Second, the report states that "the ultimate goal of publicly supported staff development activities is to enhance the performance of pupils." In the pages that follow you take up governance, professionalism, and a number of other issues, but you never again return to the question of "performance of pupils." I think, for example, that a review of the student diversity in California schools might help policy-makers understand why one needs to regionalize staff development institutes, avoid state centers, and get more decisions about staff development located at school sites where the students

actually attend school and where there are enormous differences from one school to another even within the same district. The point is that state and district planning is far less important than school site and classroom planning. Decisions must be made as close to pupils as possible. The problem is *not alignment with state and district plans*, as your recommendations consistently suggest, but alignment of teaching and a teacher's staff development with the needs of the pupils in the room. The projects that got the high evaluations in the Far West Laboratory / PACE study were the regionalized Math Projects and Writing Projects. The centralized programs were hardly mentioned in the data.

C. Third, the policy recommendations do not highlight enough the great importance of university/school cooperation in the staff development projects receiving your highest ratings (math and writing). Math and writing projects are not headquartered exclusively in districts or in county offices. They have a university sponsorship, and this sponsorship provides both neutral ground for policy discussions and an intellectual foundation for staff development programs.

D. Fourth, your policy recommendations do not place enough emphasis on the value of classroom teacher leadership in staff development. The study makes this point in many ways, but the policy recommendations ignore the point. Staff development must be reconceived as primarily a professionalization project and as secondarily an information dissemination activity.

E. In summary, the study suggests, I think, that *subjects, regionalization, university/school collaboration, and professionalism* should be the central policy recommendations for California's K-12 staff development programs.

Comments submitted by the Department of Finance

The Department of Finance's participation on the Policy Development Committee has been a very positive and worthwhile experience. We believe the work of the Policy Committee will serve as an excellent source of informed guidance in developing K-12 staff development policy.

The California Staff Development Policy Study established a substantial level of K-12 staff development funding. Expenditures for direct program activities amounted to \$366 million in the study year. When future teacher salary obligations are added, the total approaches \$1 billion in funding.

We have concerns with the Policy Committee recommendations that indicate a need for additional funding. A basic thrust of the Policy Committee's recommendations established a need to realign the organization and procedures of staff development delivery systems to more effectively address the needs of schools, teachers and pupils. Based on study findings that California's staff development programs are largely unevaluated, the Committee also supports improved evaluation measures for staff development programs. However, after establishing the need to improve the existing staff development system, the Committee then recommends increased for staff development funding. We find a basic inconsistency in this approach. We believe improvements to the existing staff development system, and evaluation of results, should precede any recommendations for additional funding.

REFERENCES

Staff Development in California: Public and Personal Investments, Program Patterns, and Policy Choices 1987. Far West Laboratory and Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE). Berkeley.

Moore, D. and A. Hyde 1981. *Making Sense of Staff Development: An Analysis of Staff Development Programs and Their Costs in Three Urban School Districts*. Chicago: Designs for Change.

A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform 1983. The National Commission on Excellence in Teaching.

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION

THE California Postsecondary Education Commission is a citizen board established in 1974 by the Legislature and Governor to coordinate the efforts of California's colleges and universities and to provide independent, non-partisan policy analysis and recommendations to the Governor and Legislature

Members of the Commission

The Commission consists of 15 members. Nine represent the general public, with three each appointed for six-year terms by the Governor, the Senate Rules Committee, and the Speaker of the Assembly. The other six represent the major segments of postsecondary education in California.

As of February 1990, the Commissioners representing the general public are

Mim Andelson, Los Angeles,
C. Thomas Dean, Long Beach,
Henry Der, San Francisco,
Seymour M. Farber, M.D., San Francisco,
Helen Z. Hansen, Long Beach,
Lowell J. Paige, El Macero, *Vice Chair*,
Cruz Reynoso, Los Angeles, *Chair*,
Sharon N. Skog, Palo Alto, and
Stephen P. Teale, M.D., Modesto

Representatives of the segments are

Yori Wada, San Francisco, appointed by the Regents of the University of California,

Theodore J. Saenger, San Francisco, appointed by the Trustees of the California State University,

John F. Parkhurst, Folsom, appointed by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges,

Harry Wugalter, Thousand Oaks, appointed by the Council for Private Postsecondary Educational Institutions;

Joseph D. Carrabino, Orange, appointed by the California State Board of Education, and

James B. Jamieson, San Luis Obispo, appointed by the Governor from nominees proposed by California's independent colleges and universities.

Functions of the Commission

The Commission is charged by the Legislature and Governor to "assure the effective utilization of public postsecondary education resources, thereby eliminating waste and unnecessary duplication, and to promote diversity, innovation, and responsiveness to student and societal needs."

To this end, the Commission conducts independent reviews of matters affecting the 2,600 institutions of postsecondary education in California, including community colleges, four-year colleges, universities, and professional and occupational schools.

As an advisory planning and coordinating body, the Commission does not administer or govern any institutions, nor does it approve, authorize, or accredit any of them. Instead, it cooperates with other State agencies and non-governmental groups that perform these functions, while operating as an independent board with its own staff and its own specific duties of evaluation, coordination, and planning.

Operation of the Commission

The Commission holds regular meetings throughout the year at which it debates and takes action on staff studies and takes positions on proposed legislation affecting education beyond the high school in California. By law, its meetings are open to the public. Requests to speak at a meeting may be made by writing the Commission in advance or by submitting a request before the start of the meeting.

The Commission's day-to-day work is carried out by its staff in Sacramento, under the guidance of its executive director, Kenneth B. O'Brien, who is appointed by the Commission.

The Commission publishes and distributes without charge some 30 to 40 reports each year on major issues confronting California postsecondary education. Recent reports are listed on the back cover.

Further information about the Commission, its meetings, its staff, and its publications may be obtained from the Commission offices at 1020 Twelfth Street, Third Floor, Sacramento, CA 95814-3985, telephone (916) 445-7933.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT IN CALIFORNIA'S PUBLIC SCHOOLS

California Postsecondary Education Commission Report 88-21

ONE of a series of reports published by the Commission as part of its planning and coordinating responsibilities. Additional copies may be obtained without charge from the Publications Office, California Postsecondary Education Commission, Third Floor, 1020 Twelfth Street, Sacramento, California 95814-3985

Recent reports of the Commission include

88-6 Comments on Educational Equity Plans of the Segments. A Staff Report on the Development of Plans by the State Department of Education, the California State University, and the University of California to Achieve the Educational Equity Goals of Assembly Concurrent Resolution 83 (1984) (February 1988)

88-7 Size, Growth, and Cost of Administration at the California State University. A Report Prepared by Price Waterhouse and MGT Consultants for the California Postsecondary Education Commission (February 1988)

88-8 Overview of the 1988-89 Governor's Budget for Postsecondary Education in California. Testimony by William H. Pickens, Executive Director, California Postsecondary Education Commission (March 1988)

88-9 Faculty Salaries in California's Public Universities, 1988-89. The Commission's 1987 Report to the Legislature and Governor in Response to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51 (1985) (March 1988)

88-10 Eligibility of California's 1986 High School Graduates for Admission to Its Public Universities. A Report of the 1986 High School Eligibility Study (March 1988)

88-11 Eligibility for Freshman Admission to the University of California. A Statement to the Regents of the University by William H. Pickens, Executive Director, California Postsecondary Education Commission, February 18, 1988 (March 1988)

88-12 Time to Degree in California's Public Universities. Factors Contributing to the Length of Time Undergraduates Take to Earn Their Bachelor's Degree (March 1988)

88-13 Evaluation of the California Academic Partnership Program (CAPP): A Report to the Legislature in Response to Assembly Bill 2398 (Chapter 620, Statutes of 1984) (March 1988)

88-14 Standardized Tests Used for Higher Education Admission and Placement in California During 1987. The Third in a Series of Annual Reports Published in Accordance with Senate Bill 1758 (Chapter 1505, Statutes of 1984) (March 1988)

88-15 Update of Community College Transfer Student Statistics Fall 1987. University of California, The California State University, and California's Independent Colleges and Universities (March 1988)

88-16 Legislative Update, March 1988. A Staff Report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (March 1988)

88-17 State Policy for Faculty Development in California Public Higher Education. A Report to the Governor and Legislature in Response to Supplemental Language in the 1986 Budget Act (May 1988)

88-18 to 20 Exploring Faculty Development in California Higher Education. Prepared for the California Postsecondary Education Commission by Berman, Weiler Associates

88-18 Volume One. Executive Summary and Conclusions, by Paul Berman and Daniel Weiler, December 1987 (March 1988)

88-19 Volume Two. Findings, by Paul Berman, Jo-Ann Intili and Daniel Weiler, December 1987 (March 1988)

88-20 Volume Three. Appendix, by Paul Berman, Jo-Ann Intili, and Daniel Weiler, January 1988 (March 1988)

88-21 Staff Development in California's Public Schools: Recommendations of the Policy Development Committee for the California Staff Development Policy Study, March 16, 1988 (March 1988)

88-22 and 23 Staff Development in California Public and Personal Investments, Program Patterns, and Policy Choices, by Judith Warren Little, William H. Gerritz, David S. Stern, James W. Guthrie, Michael W. Kirst, and David D. Marsh. A Joint Publication of Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development • Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE), December 1987

88-22 Executive Summary (March 1988)

88-23 Report (March 1988)